

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/519,829	ENGBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew Heneghan	2134	

All Participants:

(1) Matthew Heneghan.

(2) Attorney Stephen Jensen.

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2005

Time: 2:00 PM EDT

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

34

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 7/21/05
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner communicated that claim 34 as submitted was non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it taught to functional descriptive material that was not tangibly embodied. The Examiner proposed an amendment to claim 34 to bring it to a state of allowance, to which Attorney Jensen agreed..